R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 458 24

SELF-PRESENTATIONS IN RELATION TO INTERPERSONAL AND INTRAPERSONAL PERCEPTIONS, AN EXPLORATORY STUDY.

BY- INSEL, SHEPARD A. AND OTHERS
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLL., CALIF.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-111 PUB DATE 64
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$2.32 58P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PERCEPTION, PERCEPTION TESTS, *PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS, *SELF EVALUATION, SELF CONCEPT, *COLLGE STUDENTS, *GROUPS, GROUP RELATIONS, MYERS BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR, FIRO B, LEARY INTERPERSONAL CHECKLIST, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

AN ATTEMPT WAS MADE TO EXPLORE THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SELF-PRESENTATIONS AND THE INDIVIDUAL'S INTERPERSONAL AND INTRAPERSONAL PERCEPTIONS. THE EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN OF THE STUDY WAS ESSENTIALLY ONE OF INTERGROUP COMPARISON. THE SAMPLE INCLUDED 204 COLLEGE STUDENTS, FROM A VARIETY OF CLASSES AND LEVELS, WHO COMPLETED A STANDARD PERSONAL HISTORY CARD AS A REGULAR CLASS PROCEDURE. ON THE BACK OF THE CARD THEY ANSWERED THE QUESTION "WHO AM I" IN 50-100 WORDS. CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES GROUPED PHRASES INTO THOSE WHICH PRESENTED SELF IN TERMS OF EITHER INTERNAL CHARACTERISTICS OR GROUP RELEVANT CATEGORIES. STUDENTS RECEIVED PHRASE SCORES AND THE 27 PERCENT AT EACH EXTREME BECAME THE TWO CRITERION GROUPS (54 SUBJECTS FOR EACH). EACH SUBJECT WAS GIVEN THREE STANDARD PSYCHOLOGICAL INSTRUMENTS--(1) MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR, (2) FIRO-B, AND (3) LEARY INTERPERSONAL CHECKLIST. CRITICAL RATIOS WERE COMPUTED ON THE TWO CRITERION GROUPS TO TEST SEVEN HYPOTHESES. INTERCORRELATIONAL MATRICES WERE DEVELOPED FOR MALES AND FEMALES TO ASSESS THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG INSTRUMENTS. IT WAS POSSIBLE TO DIFFERENTIATE THE TWO STYLES OF SELF-PRESENTATION. THE STYLES WERE DISCUSSED IN RELATION TO CHARACTERISTICS OF SUBJECTS AND IMPLICATIONS WERE MADE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH. (JC)

EDOO3458

EDOU3420

Self-Presentations in Relation to Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Perceptions

An Exploratory Study

Cooperative Research Project No. S-111

Shepard A. Insel
Carol L. Schmida
Barrett B. Alexander

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

1964

San Francisco State College
San Francisco, California

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	1
Statement of The Problem	2
Objectives and Hypotheses	4
Related Literature	5
Procedure	8
Analysis of The Data	11
Results	12
Conclusions and Implications	37
Bibliography and References	53

List of Tables

Tables		Page
1.	Distribution of Grade Point Average For The Total Sample	12
2.	Age and Sex Distribution of Sample	12
3.	Distribution of Sample By Marital Status	13
4.	Differences Between Criterion Groups in Number of Words and Phrases in Response to Who Am I? Question	14
5.	Differences Within Criterion Groups in Number of Words and Phrases in Response to Who Am I? Question	15
6.	Mean Differences from the Midpoint (100) of the MBTI Extroversion-Introversion Scale For Criterion Groups	16
7.	Self-Presentation Styles Related to FIRO-B Scores Between Criterion Groups	18
8.	Distribution of Leary Interpersonal Check List Discrepancy Scores Between Criterion Groups	20
9.	Distribution of Leary Interpersonal Check List Discrepancy Scores Within Criterion Groups	21 & 22
10.	Distribution of Leary ICL single scores Between Criterion Groups	23
11.	Distribution of Leary ICL single scores Within Criterion Groups	25
12.	Self-presentation Styles Related to Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Continuous Scores (Between Criterion Groups)	27
13.	Self-presentation Styles Related to Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Continuous Scores (Within Criterion Group)	29
14.	Self-presentation Styles Related to FIRO-B Scores Within Criterion Groups	34
15.	Intercorrelations of Variables (Total Sample- Males)	35
16.	Intercorrelations of Variables (Total Sample- Females)	36

The Problem

The goal of this study was to examine systematically some of the psychological dimensions related to presentations of the self. Self-presentation, as the phrase is used here relates to the individual's selecting out of his broad, personal repertoire what he chooses to convey about himself. The direction of his comments stems from his own initiative, in contrast to that elicited from standard checklists or questionnaires which force a choice of responses across a range of possible characteristics.

How does the information from these two approaches relate to each other? Does the bland, impersonal picture reflect defensiveness as one theorist surmises (Rogers, 1961, P. 341)? Do different styles of self-presentation differentiate people at a more basic conceptual level? These are some of the questions to be explored by this initial study.

Recent theoretical positions suggest that self-presentations are far from random, and that the orderliness in such behavior is related in some basic ways to both interpersonal and intrapersonal processes (Goffman, 1959; Maslow, 1962; Rogers, 1961; Jourard, 1963). When a person describes who he is to another individual, he is in the process of relating conceptions and perceptions of his self-structure so that the other person will view him in the light he chooses to be seen. What he discloses is to some extent dependent on the circumstances, and to some extent on his motivations. "He may wish to make a good impression, he may wish to please his interviewer or audience, or he may wish to avoid social sanctions" (Krech and Crutchfield, 1962, P. 88). Such motivations may therefore be seen as directing the screening or revealing of his actual self-concept.

For Maslow (1962) and his self-actualizing person, and Rogers' (1961) fully functioning person, the individual would most likely present himself at any one moment in such a way that his internal experiences would be congruent with his communication. From this point of view, what he would say of himself would reflect his experiences in the immediate context. But such experiences would appear to be reflections of more generalizable factors which contribute to his total makeup.

This study proposed to examine such self-presentations as they relate to such internal aspects as 1) the person's habitual style of perceiving and judging his world, 2) his wants and self-expectations in his interpersonal relationships, and 3) his intrapersonal perceptions.

To the extent that self-presentations are found to be consonant with other inter- and intra-personal processes, such evidence would add to the growing body of knowledge about self-concept theory, thereby enabling greater understanding about human growth and development. Educational theory and practice are heavily dependent upon the increasing knowledge of human performance, particularly at the interpersonal level.

Objectives

1. Relate S's self-presentations to habitual style of perceiving and judging his world. Hypotheses tested:

   a) Individuals who present themselves in terms of group relevant categories (e.g., "man", "white", "Protestant", etc.) will tend to direct their orientations more towards their environment than to ideas and abstractions.

   b) Individuals who present themselves in terms of internal characteristics (e.g., processes such as wishes, expectations, feelings, and not otherwise open to external validation) will tend to direct their orientations more towards ideas and concepts than towards their environment.

2. Relate S's self-presentations to wants and self-expectations in his interpersonal processes. Hypotheses tested:

   a) Individuals who present themselves in terms of group relevant categories will tend to express and want affection in relation to others to a greater degree than those who present themselves in terms of internal characteristics.

   b) Individuals who present themselves in terms of group relevant categories will tend to include others and want to be included by them to a greater degree than those who present themselves in terms of internal characteristics.

3. Relate S's self-presentations to his intrapersonal processes. Hypotheses to be tested:

a) Individuals who present themselves in terms of group relevant categories will manifest fewer discrepancies between

   1) perceived self and ideal self,
   2) perceived self and how he thinks others view him,
   3) ideal self and how he thinks others view him,

than will those who present themselves in terms of internal characteristics.

4. Locate the interrelationships of the above psychological dimensions.

Related Literature

Though somewhat tangentially related to self-presentation, self-report techniques have been around in the study of personality measurement since Woodworth, 1917). For the most part, these have been forced-choice devices keyed to variously defined criterion groups, and required the respondent to deal with that which the technique asked for. Less frequently used because of the uneconomic and gross cumbersomeness of analysis has been the autiobiography (Sarbin, 1954), though this procedure left the direction of presentation up to the author.

The Who Are You technique, developed in 1950 by Bugental, started a trend more closely related to an individual's freedom to convey himself as he chose. The following outline highlights the major findings from studies using the W-A-Y technique, or variations of it:

1. Stable classifications can be made (Bugental and Zelen, 1950; Bugental and Gunning, 1955).

2. Name, occupation, and group membership most frequently reported (Bugental and Gunning, 1955).

3. More support for evidence that self-presentations are heavily infused with references to group membership; after identification of group membership, S's present themselves in evaluative terms (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954).

4. Aged persons tend to show more negative affect in self-presentations than do younger adults (Mason, 1954).

5. More relating of self to group membership and more positive affect among stutterers than non-stutterers (Zelen, Sheehan, and Bugental, 1954).

6. In a study of psychiatric vs. orthopedic patients in an Air Force hospital, the psychiatric patients used significantly more frequently the name category and significantly less frequently the group membership and uniqueness of self (Tolor, 1957).

Jourard did a series of studies involving self-presentation, which focused on the self-disclosure aspect. He defined self-disclosure as the "kind of information a person will give and to whom, such as a Subject's personal affairs" (Jourard, 1958). He specified these as 1) attitudes and beliefs (e.g. religion, 2) tastes and interests (foods, hobbies), 3) feelings about work or studies, 4) money affairs (income), 5) worries about personality, 6) concerns with body or physical appearance. He reported more overall disclosure among whites than negroes, more self-disclosure among women than men to mother and female friends.

In another study, he found that women S's will reveal themselves in proportion to their liking the recipient of their disclosures (Jourard, 1959). Another study found that men S's revealed themselves in terms of the degree to which they knew the recipients or how much the recipients had disclosed to them. In this study, liking was found to be only slightly correlated to self-disclosure (Jourard and Landsman, 1960).

From a more contiguous direction, it was found that individuals experiencing client-centered counseling represented themselves more positively both in feelings and actions (Rosenman, 1955). This finding is supported by another study in which emotional self-disclosure increased as the S's perceived their feelings to be congruent with their outer expression (Goodman, 1962).

Considering the above evidence, it would appear that self-presentations can be observed systematically. But while certain reference groups can be

delineated by what they reveal about themselves, a little has yet been done to examine the relationship of self-presentations to their more stable psychodynamic processes.

Procedure

1. General Design

The study was basically one of inter-group comparison in which two groups a) those presenting themselves primarily via group relevant categories (i.e. "man", "white", "Protestant") and open to external validation were compared with b) those presenting themselves primarily via internal characteristics (wishes, feelings, expectations, etc.) and not otherwise open to external validation. Comparisons were made in terms of their responses to three different instruments designed to locate more stable internal aspects of the individual.

2. Population and Sample

The subjects were drawn from the population of students from San Francisco State College and ranged from Freshmen through graduate students. Tables 1 and 2 describe the distribution of subjects in terms of age, sex, marital status. Table 3 depicts the grade point average for the sample. The latter index was used as a measure of intellect since the sample of 204 was found to vary in the kinds of aptitude and entrance examination tests. In a number of instances, as in the case of graduate students, aptitude or entrance examination data were unavailable.

3. Data and Instrumentation

The self-presentation material was obtained for each subject as part of a regular initial data-gathering procedure at the beginning of the courses in which completion of a personal data sheet was requested. On the front side of the sheet, the S's were asked to give the conventional information of name, age, sex, occupational and academic plans and so forth.

On the back of the sheet, they were asked to answer the question "Who Am I?" in approximately 50-100 words.

Approximately three weeks in the semester, the S's were given three psychological inventories to complete, and were told that after they were scored, the information would be returned and discussed with them as part of the course. These instruments included:

a) Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), (Myers, 1962).

This device was used to determine the way in which the individual deals with his world. Information was obtained in terms of the way people prefer to use perception and judgment. "Perception" is here understood to include the process of becoming aware,--of things, or people or occurrences or ideas. 'Judgment' is understood to include the processes of coming-to-conclusions about what has been perceived" (Myers, 1962, P. 1).

The MBTI underwent extensive analysis and stabilizing by the Educational Testing Service prior to publication and has since been used in over 75 studies (Stricker & Ross, 1962). Split half reliabilities indicate that the MBTI has shown r's in the order of .75 and above for a wide range of age, intellectual, and socio-economic status subjects (Myers, 1962, P. 20). Validation studies using external criteria indicate significant r's with faculty ratings (Ross, 1961), non-test variables (Myers, 1962, P. 28) and creativity (MacKinnon, 1959, 1960a, 1960b, 1962).

b) FIRO-B (Schutz, 1958).

This device was used to determine the S's wants and self-expectations in his interpersonal relationships. Responses to

this questionnaire are scored to estimate the individual's behavior toward others (e) and the behavior he wants from others (w) in three areas of interpersonal interaction. Thus, six scores are derived: expressed inclusion behavior (eI), wanted inclusion behavior (wI), expressed control behavior (eC), wanted control behavior (wC), expressed affection behavior (eA), and wanted affection behavior (wA).

Since the scales on this instrument are all Guttman scales, reproducibility was used as the appropriate measure of internal consistency. The usual criterion for reproducibility for this instrument is that 90 percent of all responses are predictable from knowledge of scale scores. Average reproducibility for this instrument is .94 on 1543 S's (Schutz, 1958, P. 78). Test-retest r's average .76 for all scales. Already existent groups were used with people whose attitudes are already known to test validity. FIRO-B was used to predict significantly in terms of political attitudes, occupational choice, and conformity behavior, thereby demonstrating satisfactory concurrent validity (Schutz, 1958, Chap. 4).

c) Interpersonal Check List (Leary, 1956).

This device was used to determine the individual's self-perceptions in terms of 1) his current view of self, 2) how he would like to be, and 3) how he thinks others view him. There are 128 items on this checklist.

These responses are then scored, and by use of a rather complex set of formulae derived from the MMPI studies, two total scores are obtained, one depicting the love-hostility dimension, the other depicting the dominance-submission dimension (Leary, 1956, P. 8).

Test-retest reliability r's on a homogeneous, all-female population averaged .78, so the authors state that "these correlations are not likely to be larger than ones obtainable with other groups". (Leary, 1956, P. 15).

4. Analysis of The Data

The Who Am I material was analyzed in the manner of Kuhn and McPartland (1954) and Bugental and Zelen (1950). Basically, this method involves content analysis in which the responses were categorized dichotomously. What Kuhn and McPartland called consensual references (e.g.,"athlete", "girl", "married"), we called group relevant categories. What they called sub-consensual references (e.g., "happy", "bored"; "interesting") we called internal characteristics.

The paragraphs were then broken into grammatical phrases and two judges independently assigned the phrases in each Who Am I? response to one of the two classifications. Based upon a random sample of 500 phrases, a reliability of r = .89 was computed by using the proportion of group relevant phrases over the total number of phrases for each S. Where divergent classifications occurred, the two judges discussed them and made joint decisions for final placement.

Frequency counts of the phrases were made for each S's Who Am I response, and a proportion of the highest category to the total number multiplied by 100 served as a score. Following this, 27 percent of the S's with the highest scores for each category (N = 54 for each group) were assigned to serve as the criterion groups.

5. Results

a. Analysis of the Who Am I? Data For Criterion Groups

As shown in tables 1, 2, and 3, the two criterion groups did not differ in terms of grade point average, but differed significantly in terms of age, marital status, and sex. Those presenting themselves via internal processes were younger. There were more males (N = 30) in the group relevant category and more females (N = 32) in the internals category.

Table 1
Distribution of Grade Point Average
For The Total Sample

Criterion Groups	Group Relevant Characteristics			Internal Characteristics			Total Sample		
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D
Males	30	2.33	1.13	22	2.70	.76	105	2.41	1.11
Females	24	2.50	1.22	32	2.42	1.12	99	2.51	1.12
Total	54	2.42		54	2.56		204	2.46	

Table 2
Age and Sex Distribution of Sample

Criterion Groups	Group Relevant Characteristics			Internal Characteristics			Total Sample				
	Age			Age			Critical		Age		
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D	Ratio	P	N	M	S.D
Males	30	25.63	1.43	22	23.11	.68	8.46	.01	105	25.29	1.27
Females	24	26.80	1.62	32	23.41	1.17	8.79	.01	99	25.63	1.46
Total	54	26.72		54	23.26				204	25.46	

Males and Females in Criterion Groups $\chi^2 = 3.5$, P = .07

When males and females were combined in each criterion group, as shown in Table 2, significantly more single S's were classified as internals while more married S's were classified as group relevant.

Table 3
Distribution of Sample by Marital Status

Criterion Groups	Group Relevant Characteristics			Internal Characteristics			Total Sample		
	M	S	D	M	S	D	M	S	D
Males	14	15	1	5	15	2	45	55	5
Females	9	13	2	8	22	2	36	54	9
Total	23	28	3	13	37	4	81	109	14

Married vs. Single in Criterion Groups: $\chi^2 = 4.01$, $P = .05$

Comparisons were made between and within the two criterion groups as to the number of words it took to complete the brief Who Am I question. Limits were set between 50 and 100 words and Tables 4 and 5 show the distribution of these findings. The same comparisons were made for the number of phrases and the ratio of words/phrase. It may be noted that when the males and females were combined, those presenting themselves via internal characteristics used significantly more words ($P = .01$) and also significantly more words per phrase ($P = .02$). However, both groups used almost the same mean number of phrases per Who Am I? response.

When the males of both groups were compared, the internals were found to use significantly more words/phrase ($P = .02$). An examination of the differences between the females of both groups on these

variables yielded no significant results. As may be seen in Table 4, no significant results showed up in comparisons within the criterion groups.

Table 4
Differences Between Criterion Groups in Number of Words and Phrases in Response to Who Am I? Question

BETWEEN GROUPS

Males Females combined

	Group Relevan (N=52)		Internals (N=53)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD	$\overline{Int} - \overline{GR}$	
Number of Words	60.63	27.08	76.71	32.22	2.77	.01
Number of Phrases	9.00	2.87	9.47	3.60	.75	NS
Number of Words/Phrase	6.72	2.19	7.84	2.42	2.47	.02

Males Only

	Group Relevant (N=28)		Internals (N=22)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD	$\overline{Int} - \overline{GR}$	
Number of Words	59.96	24.06	73.41	28.71	1.76	NS
Number of Phrases	9.00	2.80	9.61	3.22	.70	NS
Number of Words/Phrase	6.68	1.99	8.25	2.03	2.73	.01

Females Only

	Group Relevant (N=24)		Internals (N=31)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD	$\overline{Int} - \overline{GR}$	
Number of Words	61.41	30.19	75.58	34.48	1.62	NS
Number of Phrases	9.02	2.96	9.37	3.90	.37	NS
Number of Words/Phrase	6.78	2.41	7.55	2.62	1.13	NS

Table 5
Differences Within Criterion Groups in Number of
Words and Phrases in Response to Who Am I? Question

Total Sample

	Males (N=102)		Females (N=97)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD	$\bar{M} - \bar{F}$	
Number External/Total	.571	.269	.529	.278	1.08	NS
Number of Words	74.34	40.52	68.06	34.87	1.17	NS
Number of Phrases	9.99	4.15	9.21	3.91	1.37	NS
Number of Words/Phrase	7.19	2.55	7.06	2.36	.35	NS

Presentations via Group Relevant Characteristics

	Males (N=28)		Females (N=24)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD	$\bar{M} - \bar{F}$	
Number External/Total	.876	.169	.843	.152	.73	NS
Number of Words	59.96	24.06	61.41	30.19	—.18	NS
Number of Phrases	9.00	2.80	9.02	2.96	—.02	NS
Number of Words/Phrase	6.68	1.99	6.78	2.41	—.15	NS

Presentation via Internal Characteristics

	Males (N=22)		Females (N=31)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD	$\bar{M} - \bar{F}$	
Number External/Total	.239	.140	.211	.099	.78	NS
Number of Words	73.41	28.71	75.58	34.48	—.25	NS
Number of Phrases	9.61	3.22	9.37	3.90	.24	NS
Number of Words/Phrase	8.25	2.03	7.55	2.62	1.08	NS

b. Tests of the Hypotheses

Only findings significant beyond the .05 level of confidence were considered to be in support of the hypothesis. Findings at the .10 level were described as indicative of trends.

Hypothesis 1a. Individuals who present themselves in terms of group relevant categories will tend to direct their orientations more towards their environment than to ideas and abstractions. The test of this hypothesis included the use of the extroversion-introversion scale on the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory. In order for the hypothesis to be supported, the mean of group relevant S's scores would have had to be significantly lower than 100, the midpoint of the continuous scores on the E-I scale. Ao may be seen on Table 5, The C.R.'s for the group relevant categories, combined and by separate sexes were non-significant. Thus, the hypothesis was not supported.

Table 6
Mean Differences From The Midpoint (100) of
the MBTI Extroversion-Introversion Scale For Criterion Groups

Criterion Group	N	Mean	S.D.	Critical Ratio	P
Group Relevant Category					
All Subjects	54	99.074	21.990	—.308	NS
Males	30	97.467	17.953	—.772	NS
Females	24	101.083	26.035	.204	NS
Internal Characteristics					
All Subjects	54	99.630	23.950	—.113	NS
Males	22	98.182	23.754	—.358	NS
Females	32	100.625	24.034	.147	NS

Hypothesis 1b. Individuals who present themselves in terms of internal characteristics will tend to direct their orientations more towards ideas and abstractions and concepts than towards their environment.

As with hypothesis 1a, the E-I scale on the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory was used. In order for the hypothesis to be supported, the internal characteristics category of S's would have had to receive a mean score significantly higher than 100, the midpoint of the continuous scores on the E-I scale. Table 6 indicates that none of the three breakdowns of the internals category achieved significant C.R.'s. Thus, the hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 2a. Individuals who present themselves in terms of group relevant categories will tend to express and want affection in relation to others to a greater degree than those who present themselves in terms of internal characteristics.

The test of this hypothesis included the use of the FIRO-B subscales Expressed Affection (eA) and Wanted Affection (wA). Significantly higher mean scores for the group relevant S's would have been necessary to support the hypothesis. Table 7 shows that when only the females for both groups were compared, the hypothesis was not only unsupported, but the reverse occurred, and at the .05 level. The internals category received significantly higher mean scores. For the males and females combined, and for the males alone, the trend was in the direction opposite from the hypothesis though not significantly so.

Table 7
Self-presentation Styles Related to
FIRO-B Scores Between Criterion Groups

Males-Females Combined

	Group Relevant (N=52)		Internals (N=53)		C.R.	P*
FIRO-B	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	Int - Gr	
Expressed Inclusion	4.61	1.78	4.11	2.22	—1.27	.10
Wanted Inclusion	3.25	3.13	4.39	3.41	1.79	NS
Expressed Affection	2.86	2.20	3.56	2.21	1.62	NS
Wanted Affection	4.46	2.74	5.18	2.86	1.32	NS
Expressed Control	3.51	2.86	3.64	2.84	.21	NS
Wanted Control	4.30	2.24	4.60	2.03	.70	NS

*One-Tail Test

Males Only

	Group Relevant (N=28)		Internals (N=21)		C.R.	P*
FIRO-B	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	Int - Gr	
Expressed Inclusion	4.42	2.00	4.04	1.78	—.70	NS
Wanted Inclusion	3.35	3.18	4.57	3.28	1.29	NS
Expressed Affection	3.28	2.20	3.33	1.83	.08	NS
Wanted Affection	4.21	2.95	5.66	2.96	1.69	NS
Expressed Control	4.21	2.65	4.28	3.16	.08	NS
Wanted Control	3.82	1.90	4.52	2.01	1.23	NS

*One-Tail Test

Females Only

	Group Relevant (N=24)		Internals (N=32)		C.R.	P*
FIRO-B	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	Int - Gr	
Expressed Inclusion	4.83	1.46	4.15	2.47	—1.27	.10
Wanted Inclusion	3.12	3.07	4.28	3.49	1.31	NS
Expressed Affection	2.37	2.09	3.71	2.41	2.22	.05**
Wanted Affection	4.75	2.43	4.87	2.74	.17	NS
Expressed Control	2.70	2.89	3.21	2.53	.68	NS
Wanted Control	4.87	2.47	4.65	2.04	—.35	NS

*One-Tail Test **Two-Tail Test

Hypothesis 2b. Individuals who present themselves in terms of group relevant categories will tend to include others and want to be included by them to a greater degree than those who present in terms of internal characteristics.

The test of this hypothesis included the use of the FIRO-B subscales Expected Inclusion (eI) and Wanted Inclusion (wI). Significantly higher mean scores for the group relevant S's would have been necessary to support the hypothesis. Table 7 indicates that with the Expected Inclusion subscale, the group relevant S's (males and females combined) scored significantly higher than their internal characteristic counter parts but only at the .10 level of significance, thus constituting a trend. The same results (P=.10) occurred when the females in both groups were compared.

Hypothesis 3a. An individual who presents himself in terms of group relevant categories will manifest fewer discrepancies between 1) perceived self and ideal self, 2) perceived self and how he thinks others view him, and 3) his ideal self and how he thinks others view him, than those who present themselves in terms of internal characteristics.

The test of this hypothesis included the use of the Leary Interpersonal Check List. The S received two scores, a Dominance and a Love score for each aspect of his self system. Significantly lower mean difference scores among the group relevant category S's would have been necessary to support the hypothesis. As table 8 shows, only one significant trend appeared. When males and females

were combined the discrepancy between perceived self and others' views (Dominance) was significantly smaller for the group relevant S's (P=.06).

Table 8
Distribution of Leary Interpersonal Check List
Discrepancy Scores Between Criterion Groups

Males - Females Combined

Discrepancy	Internals (N=53) M	S.D.	Group Relevant (N=52) M	S.D.	Critical Ratio	P One-Tail Test	F	P
Dominance					Inf. GR.			
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	6.400	5.733	7.057	8.242	-.473	N.S.	2.07	.01
Ideal Self - Others' Views	3.967	6.181	6.234	7.693	-1.662	N.S.	-	
Perceived Self - Others' Views	-2.432	4.465	-.823	4.212	-1.899	.06	-	
Love								
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	4.067	7.892	3.590	6.811	.332	N.S.	-	
Ideal Self - Others' Views	4.828	8.087	3.615	8.399	.753	N.S.	-	
Perceived Self - Others' Views	.760	4.203	.025	5.360	.781	N.S.	-	

Males Only

Discrepancy	Internals (N=22) M	S.D.	Group Relevant (N=28) M	S.D.	Critical Ratio	P	F	P
Dominance								
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	6.618	4.941	6.653	8.833	-.017	N.S.	3.19	.001
Ideal Self - Others' Views	5.477	5.205	6.717	9.124	-.604	N.S.	3.06	.001
Perceived Self - Others' Views	-1.140	3.650	.064	4.375	-1.061	N.S.	-	
Love								
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	3.590	9.574	4.917	7.084	-.543	N.S.	-	
Ideal Self - Others' Views	3.727	8.340	3.753	8.481	-.010	N.S.	-	
Perceived Self - Others' Views	.136	3.853	-1.164	5.207	1.014	N.S.	1.80	.05

Females Only

	Internals (N=31) M	S.D.	Group Relevant (N=24) M	S.D.	Critical Ratio	P	F	P
Dominance								
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	6.245	6.230	7.529	7.466	-.679	N.S.		
Ideal Self - Others' Views	2.896	6.583	5.670	5.525	-1.697	N.S.		
Perceived Self - Others' Views	-3.348	4.754	-1.858	3.756	-1.298	N.S.		
Love								
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	4.406	6.416	2.041	6.126	1.390	N.S.		
Ideal Self - Others' Views	5.609	7.809	3.454	8.300	.979	N.S.		
Perceived Self - Others' Views	1.203	4.381	1.412	5.20	-.158	N.S.		

Had a two-tail test been applied: findings opposite in direction to the prediction would have occurred in two places. When the combined males and females were compared for both criterion groups on the ideal self--others' views (Dominance) discrepancy, the group relevant category S's were shown to have a larger mean difference (P=.10, two-tail test). The same occurred when Females only were compared. Indeed, though not at the levels of significance, the mean differences were found to be smaller for the internals group 10 out of 18 times.

An examination of within-group discrepancies indicated that males in the group relevant category had lower mean discrepancies between perceived self and "others'" views for both Dominance and Love than the females. Males in the internals group showed lower discrepancies between their perceived self and "others'" views scores for Dominance. Table 9 shows these findings.

Table 9
Distribution of Leary Interpersonal Check List
Discrepancy Scores Within Criterion Groups

Self-Presentations via Group Relevant Characteristics

Discrepancy	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	Critical Ratio M-F	P*
Dominance	Females (N=24)		Males (N=28)			
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	7.529	7.466	6.653	8.833	-.387	
Ideal Self - Others' Views	5.670	5.525	6.717	9.124	.508	
Perceived Self - Others' Views	-1.858	3.756	.064	4.375	1.704	.10
Love						
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	2.041	6.126	4.917	7.084	1.569	
Ideal Self - Others' Views	3.454	8.300	3.753	8.481	.128	
Perceived Self - Others' Views	1.412	5.200	-1.164	5.207	-1.780	.10

*2-Tail Tests

- Table 9 Continued -

Self-Presentations via Internal Characteristics

Discrepancy	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	Critical Ratio	P
Dominance	Females (N=31)		Males (N=22)			
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	6.245	6.230	6.618	4.941	.242	
Ideal Self - Others' Views	2.896	6.583	5.477	5.205	1.591	
Perceived Self - Others' Views	-3.348	4.754	-1.140	3.650	1.910	.10
Love						
Ideal Self - Perceived Self	4.406	6.416	3.590	9.574	-.347	
Ideal Self - Others' Views	5.609	7.809	3.727	8.340	-.831	
Perceived Self - Others' Views	1.203	4.381	.136	3.853	-.937	

To account for these discrepancy scores, tests were run on each single variable in the Leary Interpersonal Check List. Mean scores for both Dominance and Love categories were derived and comparisons were made between and within groups. Table 10 indicates the findings between criterion groups, while table 11 shows the results within the criterion groups.

As may be noted in Table 10, the internals category, males and females combined, saw others viewing them as being more dominant than did the group relevant S's perception of others viewing themselves (P=.06). The same finding occurred when females only were compared for the two criterion groups (P=.08). Table 10 also shows that the females in the group relevant category received higher Perceived self (Love) scores than did the internals (P=.07).

Further examination of within-group comparisons as shown in Table 11 indicates that males in the group relevant category scored significantly higher on Perceived Self (Dominance) than the females

TABLE 10

Distribution of Leary Interpersonal Check List
Between Criterion Groups

Males - Females Combined

	Group Relevant (N=52)		Internals (N=53)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD		
Dominance						
Perceived Self	2.79	5.31	3.37	6.47	.50	ns
Ideal Self	9.85	5.38	9.77	3.39	-.08	ns
Others' View	3.61	5.21	5.81	6.49	1.91	.06
Love						
Perceived Self	.07	7.06	-1.07	8.25	-.76	ns
Ideal Self	3.66	5.08	2.99	6.12	-.61	ns
Others' View	.05	7.11	-1.83	8.24	-1.25	ns

Males Only

	Group Relevant (N=28)		Internals (N=22)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD		
Dominance						
Perceived Self	4.11	4.99	4.75	5.62	.42	ns
Ideal Self	10.76	6.27	11.37	3.32	.44	ns
Others' View	4.04	5.87	5.90	5.97	1.09	ns
Love						
Perceived Self	-1.97	7.46	-1.75	10.04	.08	ns
Ideal Self	2.94	5.67	1.83	7.80	-.56	ns
Others' View	-.80	7.54	-1.89	8.89	-.45	ns

Females Only

	Group Relevant (N=24)		Internals (N=31)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD		
Dominance						
Perceived Self	1.25	5.26	2.40	6.85	.70	ns
Ideal Self	8.78	3.85	8.64	2.95	-.14	ns
Others' View	3.11	4.26	5.74	6.84	1.75	.08
Love						
Perceived Self	2.46	5.69	-.59	6.64	-1.83	.07
Ideal Self	4.50	4.15	3.80	4.38	-.60	ns
Others' View	1.05	6.43	-1.80	7.74	-1.48	ns

(P=.05) They scored significantly lower on Perceived Self (Love) than the females (P=.02)

For those presenting themselves via internal characteristics, the males scored significantly higher on the Ideal Self (Dominance) than the females (P=.002).

Though the mean scores on the Ideal Self (Dominance) for the males presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics was not significantly greater than those of the females, an F-test indicates that they were significantly more variable (P=.01). The same holds true for the males presenting themselves via internal characteristics on the ideal self (Love) (P=.01).

TABLE 11

Distribution of Leary Interpersonal Check List
Within Criterion Groups

Total Sample

	Males (N=102)		Females (N=97)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD	$\bar{M}$-$\bar{F}$	
Dominance						
Perceived Self	3.87	6.02	1.79	6.61	2.31	.05
Ideal Self	10.54	4.19	9.01	3.38	2.83	.01
Others' View	5.32	6.53	4.52	6.06	.89	ns
Love						
Perceived Self	-2.38	7.61	.54	6.75	-2.86	.01
Ideal Self	1.99	5.73	4.60	4.18	-3.68	.001
Others' View	-2.37	7.80	.10	7.22	-2.33	.02

Presentations Via Group Relevant Characteristics

	Males (N=26)		Females (N=24)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD	$\bar{M}$-$\bar{F}$	
Dominance						
Perceived Self	4.11	4.99	1.25	5.26	1.99	.05
Ideal Self	10.76	6.27*	8.78	3.85*	1.39	ns
Others' View	4.04	5.87	3.11	4.26	.66	ns
Love						
Perceived Self	-1.97	7.46	2.46	5.69	-2.42	.02
Ideal Self	2.94	5.67	4.50	4.15	-1.13	ns
Others' View	-.80	7.54	1.05	6.43	-.95	ns

* F = 2.64, P = .01

Presentations Via Internal Characteristics

	Males (N=22)		Females (N=31)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	SD	M	SD	$\bar{M}$-$\bar{F}$	
Dominance						
Perceived Self	4.75	5.62	2.40	6.85	1.37	ns
Ideal Self	11.37	3.32	8.64	2.95	3.08	.002
Others' View	5.90	5.97	5.74	6.84	.08	ns
Love						
Perceived Self	-1.75	10.04**	-.59	6.64**	-.47	ns
Ideal Self	1.83	7.80*	3.80	4.38*	-1.07	ns
Others' View	-1.89	8.89	-1.80	7.74	-.03	ns

* F = 3.2, P = .01 ** F = 2.34, P = .05

c. Additional Findings

Since the instruments used to test the main hypotheses with the two criterion groups rendered scores on other scales, tests were run to examine any other possible differences which emerged. The null hypothesis was applied in each case, using a two-tail test to estimate significance. For within-group comparisons it was also decided that the total sample would be used in addition to the criterion groups.

To begin with, Table 12 shows that though the two criterion groups did not differ significantly on the major hypothesis (1a) of orientation or preference to the external or internal world, they did differ significantly in two other areas measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

The S's presenting themselves via internal characteristics scored significantly higher on the Intuition scale (P = .01) and on the Perceiving scale (P = .01). When males only were compared, the internals scored significantly higher on three out of the four dichotomous scales (converted to continuous scores). Table 12 shows higher scores for this group on Intuition (P = .02), Feeling (P = .05), and Perceiving (P = .02).

When females only were compared, the internals showed only trends toward significance on the Intuition (P = .10) and Perceiving (P = .10) scales as indicated on Table 12.

Table 12
Self-presentation Styles Related To
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Continuous Scores
(Between Criterion Groups)

Males - Females Combined

	Group Relevant (N = 54)		Internals			
MBTI	M	S D	M	S D	Critical Ratio	P
Extroversion-Introversion	99.07	21.98	99.62	23.95	.12	NS
Sensing-Intuitive	103.96	28.98	118.03	21.77	2.85	.01
Thinking-Feeling	98.29	24.07	104.29	21.06	1.37	NS
Judging-Perceiving	95.14	25.42	110.14	28.29	2.89	.01

Males Alone

	Group Relevant (N = 30)		Internals (N = 22)			
	M	S.D.	M	S D.	Critical Ratio	P
Extroversion-Introversion	97.46	17.95	98.18	23.75	.11	NS
Sensing-Intuitive	102.33	29.66	118.18	16.77	2.44	.02
Thinking-Feeling	90.93	23.09	103.45	19.29	2.12	.05
Judging-Perceiving	92.86	26.98	111.63	29.16	2.36	.02

Females Alone

	Group Relevant (N = 24)		Internals (N = 32)			
	M	S D	M	S D	Critical Ratio	P
Extroversion-Introversion	101.08	26.03	100.62	24.03	-.06	NS
Sensing-Intuitive	106.00	27.99	117.93	24.63	1.66	.10
Thinking-Feeling	107.50	22.01	104.87	22.18	-.44	NS
Judging-Perceiving	98.00	23.02	109.12	27.63	1.64	.10

An examination of within-group comparisons on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator yielded differences between the males and females only in the group relevant category on the Thinking-Feeling scale. As may be expected, females scored significantly higher on feeling ($P = .01$). It is interesting to note that the males presenting themselves via internal characteristics scored almost the same as the corresponding females on this scale. But when all males in the sample were combined and compared with the total female sample, the difference on the Feeling Scale as indicated in Table 13 is strikingly significant at the .0001 level of confidence.

The major hypotheses involving the use of FIRO-B included the Affection and Inclusion Scales, but did not consider the Control Scale. Table 14 indicates that between-group differences for this Scale were not significant.

Table 13
Self-presentation Styles Related To
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores
(Within Criterion Groups)

Presentations Via Group Relevant Characteristics

M B T I	Females (N = 24)		Males (N = 30)		C.R.	P
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	$\bar{M}-\bar{F}$	
*Extroversion-Introversion	101.08	26.03	97.46	17.95	-.57	NS
Sensory-Intuitive	106.00	27.99	102.33	29.66	-.46	NS
Thinking-Feeling	107.50	22.01	90.93	23.09	-2.68	.01
Judging-Perceiving	98.00	23.02	92.86	26.98	-.75	NS

*Hypothesis 1a

Presentations Via Internal Characteristics

M B T I	Females (N = 32)		Males (N = 22)		C.R.	P
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	$\bar{M}-\bar{F}$	
*Extroversion-Introversion	100.62	24.03	98.18	23.75	-.36	NS
Sensory-Intuitive	117.93	24.63	118.18	16.77	.04	NS
Thinking-Feeling	104.87	22.18	103.45	19.29	-.24	NS
Judging-Perceiving	109.12	27.63	111.63	29.16	.31	NS

*Hypothesis 16

Total Sample

	Females (N = 99)		Males (N = 105)		C.R.	P
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	$\bar{M}-\bar{F}$	
Extroversion-Introversion	99.82	24.28	100.27	22.58	.13	NS
Sensory-Intuitive	115.98	25.54	111.70	25.83	-1.19	NS
Thinking-Feeling	106.44	22.45	95.80	20.34	-3.54	.0001
Judging-Perceiving	108.43	25.03	103.24	28.21	-1.39	NS

Within group differences on the FIRO-B Control scales indicated that when the total sample was considered, the males received significantly higher expressed control scores than did the females (P = .00001). Table 14 shows this result plus the finding that for those presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics, the males received higher scores on Expressed Control (P = .10) while the females received higher scores on Wanted Control (P = .10).

It is once again noteworthy that the males and females presenting themselves via internal characteristics scored quite similarly on all the FIRO-B scales including Control as is pointed out by Table 14.

Intercorrelation Matrix

All of the variables used in this study were intercorrelated using the total sample separated by sex. It was felt that these results would be useful to point up possible latent factors related to the major hypotheses but not otherwise identifiable without some intercorrelational evidence. The sexes were separated since all of the instruments used have found that sex differences are indicated in the norms.

The two matrices are shown as Table 15 for the males and Table 16 for the females. Of the 210 r's for the males, 18.1 percent or 38 were signigicang beyond the .05 level of significance. The matrix for the females on Table 12 shows that 24.8 percent or 52 out of 210 r's were beyond the .05 level. When within-test r's were excluded, the percentage decreased to 14.2 percent or 24 r's for the males (z = 5.51), while for the females the percentage decreased to 21 or 37 out of 176 r's (z = 9.5).

The following listing represents only those r's which emerged significantly.

1. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator continuous scores

   a. Extroversion-Introversion Scale vs. Leary ICL.

	Males	Females
Perceived Self (Dominance)	-.39	-.39
Perceived Self (Love)	-.24	-.24
Ideal Self (Love)	-	-.25
Others' Views (Dominance)	-.26	-.36
Others' Views (Love)	-.21	-

   b. Sensory-Intuition Scale vs. Leary ICL.

Perceived Self (Dominance)	-	.27
Perceived Self (Love)	-.21	-
Others' Views (Dominance)	-	.26
Others' Views (Love)	-.20	-

   c. Thinking-Feeling Scale vs. Leary ICL.

Perceived Self (Love)	.24	.29
Ideal Self (Love)	-	.25
Others' Views (Love)	.23	-

   d. Judging-Perceiving vs. Leary ICL.

	Males
Perceived Self (Love)	-.25
Others' Views (Love)	-.23

2. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Continuous Scoes vs. FIRO-B.

	Males	Females
a. Extroversion-Introversion Scale vs.		
Expressed Inclusion (eI)	-.30	-.52
Wanted Inclusion (wI)	-.21	-.29
Expressed Control (eC)	-	-.38
Expressed Affection (eA)	-.31	-.31
Wanted Affection (wA)	-	-.23
b. Sensory-Intuition Scale vs.		
Expressed Inclusion (eI)	-.26	-
c. Thinking-Feeling Scale vs.		
Expressed Inclusion (eI)	-	.22
Wanted Control (wC)	-	.23
Wanted Affection (wA)	-	.33
3. Leary Interpersonal Check List vs. FIRO-B.		
a. Ideal Self (Dominance) vs.		
Expressed Inclusion	-	.25
b. Others' Views (Dominance) vs.		
Expressed Control (eC)	.21	.30
c. Perceived Self (Love) vs.		
Expressed Inclusion (eI)	.46	.43
Wanted Inclusion (wI)	-	.27
Expressed Affection (eA)	.31	.31
Wanted Affection (wA)	.21	.45
Wanted Control (wC)		.42

	Male	Female
d. Ideal Self (Love) vs.		
Expressed Inclusion (eI)	.20	-
Expressed Affection (eA)	.23	-
Wanted Affection (wA)	-	.33
e. Others' Views (Love) vs.		
Expressed Inclusion (eI)	.36	-
4. Who Am I Responses vs. Leary Interpersonal Check List		
a. Number of Words vs.		
Perceived Self (Dominance)	-	.34
Others' Views (Dominance)	-	.28
b. Number of Phrases vs.		
Perceived Self (Dominance)	-	.33
Others' Views (Dominance)	.23	.27
5. Who Am I Responses vs. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator		
a. Number of Words vs.		
Extroversion-Introversion Scale	-	-.27
b. Number of Phrases vs.		
Extroversion-Introversion Scale	-	-.30
Judging-Perceiving Scale	-.37	-
6. Grade Point Average vs. Leary Interpersonal Check List		
Ideal Self (Love) vs. GPA	-	.24

Table 14
Self-presentation Styles Related To
FIRO-B Scores Within Criterion Groups

Total Sample	Males (N=99)		Females (N=102)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	$\bar{M} - \bar{F}$	
Expressed Inclusion	4.19	2.07	4.59	2.05	-1.26	NS
Wanted Inclusion	3.84	3.17	3.53	3.28	.67	NS
Expressed Affection	3.32	2.21	3.22	2.30	.31	NS
Wanted Affection	4.50	2.91	4.89	2.50	-1.01	NS
Expressed Control	4.30	2.76	2.74	2.49	4.19	.00001
Wanted Control	4.36	2.02	4.43	2.25	- .23	NS

Presentations Via Group Relevant Characteristics

	Males (N=28)		Females (N=24)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	$\bar{M} - \bar{F}$	
Expressed Inclusion	4.42	2.00	4.83	1.46	- 83	NS
Wanted Inclusion	3.35	3.18	3.12	3.07	.26	NS
Expressed Affection	3.28	2.20	2.37	2.09	1.52	NS
Wanted Affection	4.21	2.95	4.75	2.43	-.71	NS
Expressed Control	4.21	2.65	2.70	2.89	1.94	.10
Wanted Control	3.82	1.90	4.87	2.47	-1.69	.10

Presentations Via Internal Characteristics

	Males (N=21)		Females (N=32)		Critical Ratio	P
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.
Expressed Inclusion	4.04	1.78	4.15	2.47	-.18	NS
Wanted Inclusion	4.57	3.28	4.28	3.49	.30	NS
Expressed Affection	3.33	1.83	3.71	2.41	-.65	NS
Wanted Affection	5.66	2.96	4.87	2.74	.97	NS
Expressed Control	4.28	3.16	3.21	2.53	1.29	NS
Wanted Control	4.52	2.01	4.65	2.04	-.23	NS

Table 15

Intercorrelation of Variables
Total Sample - MALES
N = 105

		eI	eC	eA	wI	wC	wA	DOM PS	DOM IS	DOM OV	LOV PS	LOV IS	LOV OV	E/I	S/N	T/F	J/P	Ext Total # Words	# Phrases	Words / Phrases	GPA
FIRO-B	eC	.13																			
	eA	.42	.02																		
	wI	.29	.17	.30																	
	wC	.24	.01	.07	.10																
	wA	.23	.32	.39	.46	.05															
Dom Leary	P.S.	.08	-.13	.14	-.00	.21	-.00														
	I.S.	.07	-.00	-.04	.08	.05	-.03	.05													
	O.V.	.11	.21	.14	.07	-.15	-.06	.75	.06												
Love	P.S.	.46	-.15	.31	.13	.16	.21	.05	.01	.05											
	I.S.	.20	-.17	.23	.10	-.01	.02	.13	.17	.11	.45										
	O.V.	.36	-.15	.16	.10	.04	.08	-.00	.00	.00	.77	.35									
Myers-Briggs	E/I	-.30	-.13	-.31	-.21	-.08	-.10	-.39	.01	-.26	-.24	-.17	-.21								
	S/N	-.26	.02	.09	.02	.09	.09	-.02	-.02	-.03	-.21	-.09	-.20	.01							
	T/F	.04	-.08	.06	.01	.11	.12	-.14	-.04	-.14	.24	.02	.23	.08	.18						
	J/P	-.00	.00	-.01	.03	-.04	-.06	-.02	.04	-.11	-.25	-.16	-.23	.00	.29	.08					
WA I	External Total	-.01	.01	-.05	-.08	-.17	-.15	-.00	.02	-.09	.02	.09	.09	-.06	-.28	-.19	-.20				
	# Words	-.05	.05	-.06	-.05	.00	-.00	-.13	.08	.01	-.13	-.09	.08	.07	-.02	-.16	-.18	.01			
	# Phrases	.03	.05	.06	-.03	.07	.09	.09	.01	.23	.03	.04	.02	.02	.10	-.17	-.09	-.04	.19		
	Words / Phrases	.06	.07	-.03	-.13	-.08	.09	.10	-.13	.10	.14	.03	.14	-.10	-.08	-.03	-.37	-.04	.52	.19	
	GPA	-.02	-.01	.08	-.09	-.11	.06	-.09	.10	-.08	-.05	.00	-.15	.18	.02	-.02	.02	.12	-.11	-.13	-.07

r = .254 for .01 level, .195 for .05 level.

TABLE 16

Intercorrelation of Variables
Total Sample - Females
N = 99

		eI	eC	eA	wI	wC	wA	Dom PS	Dom IS	Dom OV	Lov PS	Lov IS	Lov OV	E/I	S/N	T/F	J/P	External Total	# Words	# Phrases	Words Phrases	GPA
FIRO-B	eC	.24																				
	eA	.38	.27																			
	wI	.48	.29	.34																		
	wC	.31	.20	.15	.24																	
	wA	.38	.13	.56	.46	.26																
Dom	PS	.20	.20	.14	-.01	-.24	-.05															
	IS	.25	.17	.15	.19	.12	.14	.08														
	OV	.17	.30	.16	.16	-.14	-.02	.68	.19													
Lov	PS	.43	.04	.31	.27	.42	.45	-.08	.17	-.04												
	IS	.20	.06	.09	.20	.05	.33	-.03	.00	-.04	.28											
	OV	-.04	-.07	-.02	.11	-.19	-.06	-.12	.15	-.11	-.11	-.04										
Myers-Briggs	E/I	-.52	-.38	-.31	-.29	-.02	-.23	-.39	-.02	-.30	-.24	-.25	.01									
	S/N	-.07	.11	.12	-.09	-.11	-.04	.27	.14	.26	-.14	-.02	-.20	-.06								
	T/F	.22	.11	.15	.07	.23	.33	.02	.17	.08	.29	.25	.03	-.19	.13							
	J/P	-.06	-.01	.12	-.09	-.10	.04	.17	.08	.20	-.10	.01	-.06	.00	.64	.16						
WAI	External Total	.16	-.12	-.13	-.13	.04	.02	-.03	.12	-.15	.16	.01	.22	-.01	-.16	-.01	-.11					
	# Words	.13	.07	.03	.15	.02	-.05	.34	-.01	.28	.02	.01	-.02	-.27	-.01	-.04	.03	-.26				
	# Phrases	.17	.07	.05	.16	.07	.02	.33	-.00	.27	.04	.12	.04	-.30	-.01	.05	.06	-.10	.81			
	Words Phrases	-.06	.02	-.07	-.04	-.07	-.18	.04	-.15	-.05	-.14	-.14	-.08	-.08	-.08	-.15	-.14	-.28	.53	-.12		
	GPA	.09	.00	.05	.03	.11	.13	.04	-.03	.04	.20	-.24	-.17	-.06	.17	.11	.08	.00	.08	.08	-.02	

r = .267 for .01 level, .205 for .05 level

Conclusions and Implications

The central purpose of this exploratory study had to do with identifying ways by which individuals present themselves systematically to others and then relating such self-presentations to 1) the person's habitual style of perceiving and judging his world, 2) his wants and self-expectations in his inter personal relationships, and 3) his intra personal perceptions. This section will discuss each aspect of the findings in relation to the above internal processes, after describing the characteristics of the two criterion groups.

To begin with, it was possible to differentiate two styles of written self-presentations along a continuum ranging from those who presented themselves primarily in terms of commonly accepted group referents on one end to those who presented themselves primarily in terms of what was going on within them, such as feelings, wishes, hopes, expectations on the other.

It must be understood that that these persons were presenting themselves at the initial stages of a relationship with an instructor in a college class from which they hoped to achieve an adequate grade. In addition, they were asked to present themselves by answering an ambiguous question, even though they had completed a questionnaire asking for very specific information about themselves first. Thus, whatever they presented had to facilitate some motives of their own and be consistent with their self-images -- and perhaps approximate some image they thought the instructor had towards the "good" or "adequate" student.

The two criterion groups representing these two extremes of self-presentation manifested other differences. The total sample averaged 25.4

years in age, with no age differences emerging between the males and females. However, the S's presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics were on the average 2.5 to 3.2 years older than those presenting themselves via internal processes.

Marriage wise, there were significantly more single students among the latter group, while more group relevant S's were married. This finding relates to the age difference as much as any thing else. More females presented themselves via internal processes than males, while the reverse was true for those presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics.

It also appears that those presenting themselves via internal processes used significantly more words (though not more phrases), and therefore more numbers of words per phrase in their responses on the Who Am I? This increase could be due to greater uncertainty, or at least less sharply defined conceptions of self. The categorical stereotypes of "man," "woman," "Protestant", have the advantage of using single terms to convey an image, while to convey what is going on within oneself requires greater elaboration. At a more detailed level, the males presenting themselves via internal processes used significantly more words per phrase than their group relevant counterparts.

1) Self-Presentations and the person's habitual style of perceiving and judging his world.

The findings in this study did not support the hypothesis that persons who present themselves via group relevant characteristics would be oriented primarily towards the outer world and thus tend to focus their perceptions and judgments on people and things. Nor did the evidence support the contention that persons who present themselves via internal processes would orient themselves

more towards ideas and concepts than towards their tangible environments. Indeed, the two groups appear to come from the same population when the Extroversion-Introversion Scale is considered. Both means and standard deviations were very much alike on this scale for all breakdowns of the data. On greater reflection, this finding need not be too surprising, for the Extroversion-Introversion Scale may be describing types in the more categorical sense, while self-presentations are processes which may cut across types. In addition, the self-presentations may be more heavily dependent on the phase of a relationship and therefore be unstable in the sense that individuals will shift to a more intimate style as they come closer to others. This point of view has received some support from Rogers in the use of his psychotherapy scale (Rogers, 1961, Chap. 7).

On the other hand, the other three scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator differentiated the two criterion groups quite significantly. The test author describes the Sensing-Intuition, Thinking-Feeling, Judging-Perceiving scales as measuring processes of "becoming aware" and "coming-to-conclusions about what has been perceived" (Myers, 1962, P. 1). In terms of such processes, it appears that persons who present themselves in terms of internal processes are significantly more intuitive in their approach to their worlds than are their group relevant counterparts. It should be pointed out however, that the group relevant category S's scored more in the direction of intuition than towards the Sensing direction (M = 103.96, below 100 would be in the Sensing direction), but were significantly more variable in this respect (P = .05).

The males in the internal processes category were sharply differentiated

from their opposite numbers in the group relevant category (P = .02), whereas the females were not so clearly differentiated (P = .10). This was because the group relevant category females had higher intuition scores than the males in that group.

The Thinking-Feeling Scale on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator differentiated only the males in the two criterion groups (P = .05). In this instance, the males who presented themselves via group relevant characteristics scored heavily in the Thinking end of the continuum, while those who presented themselves via internal processes showed a mean score in the Feeling end of the continuum. The females in both groups showed mean scores in the Feeling category. Thus, when both sexs were combined to compare the two criterion groups no differences emerged.

The Judging-Perceiving Scale on the Myers-Briggs clearly differentiated the two criterion groups (P = .01). The group relevant category S's showed mean scores in the judging end of the continuum both in the combined male-female group and in the tests comparing males and females separately. The males for both criterion groups were differentiated more sharply (P = .02) than the females (P = .10). Nevertheless, the S's in the three breakdowns presenting themselves via internal processes showed mean scores in the Perceiving end of the J-P continuum.

The above findings suggest a general and theoretical consistency according to the evidence reported in the Myers-Briggs Manual (Myers, 1962, P. 54-58). Persons who present themselves via group relevant characteristics have committed themselves to categories, made judgments about themselves which are for the most part clearly defined. Persons who present themselves via internal processes are

describing what is happening to them internally, what they are experiencing and perceiving within themselves.

Myers (P. 58) points out that "In the judging attitude, in order to come to a conclusion, perception must be shut off for the time being. The evidence is all in. Anything more is incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial. One now arrives at a verdict and gets things settled. Conversely, in the perceptive attitude one shuts off judgment for the time being. The evidence is not all in. There is much more to it than this. New developments will occur. It is much too soon to do anything irrevocable."

That the S's who presented themselves via group relevant characteristics were also oriented toward the Thinking category on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, while those presenting themselves via internal processes were oriented towards the Feeling category is also appropriate. According to Myers (P. 56), those prefering the Thinking category tend to be logical, impersonal, oriented towards structure and organization. Those who prefer the Feeling orientation (and combined with Intuition) use this combination to center their attention less on concrete situations and more on possibilities, sometimes perceived unconsciously and imagined and not yet clearly defined. The greater wordiness of the internal processes S's in this study would seem to support this view.

2) Self-presentations and the person's wants and self-expectations in his inter personal relationships.

The hypotheses that persons presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics will tend to 1) express and want affection and 2) include others and want to be included by them to a greater degree than those presenting

themselves via internal processes were only partially supported, and at the trend level at that.

According to the results of the tests, those presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics only show a tendency to feel included by others to a greater extent than those presenting themselves via internal processes. Presumably their explicit identification with groups may be operating more definitively here.

With respect to affection, the trend was actually reversed from the hypotheses. Had a two-tail test been used, the findings would have been significant that those presenting themselves via internal processes both expressed and wanted affection to a greater extent than their group relevant counterparts. This finding actually appears to be more consistent with the emerging overall picture regarding those presenting themselves via internal processes. Since they are more oriented towards feelings and wishes it seems appropriate that they would tend to express affection and want to be included by others. Incidentally, this finding only held for the females of the criterion groups.

With respect to the Expressed Control and Wanted Control Scale findings, no differences between the two criterion groups emerged. However, the high order difference between sexes ($P = .00001$) when the total sample was pooled, supports Schutz in the fact that the Expressed Control Scale strikingly differentiates the sexes (Schutz, 1960, P. 74).

A noteworthy difference emerged at the trend level ($P = .10$) with the group relevant males expressing control to a greater degree than the females in that category, and the females wanting control to a greater extent than the males. The males and females presenting themselves via internal processes did not show

these differences. Since the differences between the males of both groups or the females of both groups were not significant, interpretation of the within-group relevant category is unclear. It may be that the females presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics, when compared with the males, tend to see themselves as slightly less adequate than males see themselves or are inclined to respect others to a lesser extent. Schutz states with regard to feelings about control that " ...the need for control is defined as the need to establish and maintain a feeling of mutual respect for the competence and responsibleness of others. This feeling includes (1) being able to respect others to a satisfactory degree and (2) having others respect the self to a satisfactory degree (P. 20).

3) Self-presentations in relation to intra personal perceptions.

Once again the hypotheses that those presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics would show fewer discrepancies between various aspects of their self systems than those presenting themselves via internal processes received only slight support.

By using the Leary Interpersonal Check List two scores emerged for each of the 1) perceived self, 2) ideal self, and 3) how others view him responses. Thus, there were discrepancy scores for Dominance and Love. It was assumed that those presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics would be more in tune with their outer worlds and therefore would receive greater feedback about themselves from others. This line of reasoning went on then to the next assumption that there would be a greater congruency between how the individual perceived himself and how he thought others viewed him. Though this particular discrepency did receive the smallest difference, it was not

large enough to significantly differentiate the two criterion groups beyond the .06 level.

That the reverse should be found for the females when both groups were compared on the ideal self - others' views (Dominance) may more clearly be understood by the finding that females presenting themselves via group relevant categories think others view them as less dominant than their internal process counterparts think others view themselves. Which ones are more realistic in this respect remains to be clarified by comparing these perceptions with outside observer responses. It should also be noted, however, that in four of the discrepancies, the group relevant category S's contained significantly more variability in their responses.

To explain some of these findings, separate tests were run on the individual variables of the self system. The only variable which differentiated the combined males-females criterion groups was how they thought others viewed them (P = .06) in terms of dominance. Those presenting themselves via internal processes thought others viewed them as being more dominant than the group relevant S's thought others viewed themselves to be.

The females presenting themselves via group relevant characteristics perceived themselves as more loving than were the self-perceptions of those who presented themselves via internal processes (P = .07). In addition, the latter group were significantly more variable (P = .01)

Both groups followed similar and expected patterns, with respect to self-perception scores of dominance: perceived selves were lowest, ideal selves were highest, and others' views were in the middle. With respect to self-perception scores of love, once again they were similar: others' views were lowest for the

combined males-females, perceived selves were in the middle, and ideal selves were highest. A shift occurred for the males who presented themselves via group relevant characteristics. They perceived themselves as less loving than they thought others viewed them. However, the resulting differences were not significant.

Thus, except in some minor respects, the two criterion groups were considered to be similar when it comes to their intra personal perceptions. It would be useful to identify the ability of the two groups to assess how others view them. Such a finding would determine the reality of perceptions as a differentiating factor.

In summary, the two criterion groups may be considered to come from different populations mostly in terms of the ways they perceive and judge their worlds. As far as the instruments used in this study are concerned, and the sample to which the instruments were applied, self-presentation styles as defined here are more clearly related to processes of becoming aware and drawing conclusions. They are less clearly related to interpersonal process needs and intra personal perceptions.

Conclusions About The Intercorrelation Matrices

It was hypothesized that S's presenting themselves via group relevant categories would also receive low scores (extrovert) on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator continuous scale for Extroversion-Introversion. Low scores (below 100) would imply Extroversion, high scores (above 100) would imply Introversion. It was also hypothesized that there would be positive relationships between group relevant presentations and four of the scales on the FIRO-B: expressed inclusion, expressed affection, wanted inclusion, and wanted affection.

If these relationships did exist, we should also expect the Extroversion-Introversion scale to be negatively related expressed inclusion, to expressed affection, to wanted inclusion, and to wanted affection. As shown in Table 16, all four of these correlations were negative and significant for the female sample, while Table 15 indicates that all four correlations were negative for the male sample; however, only three reached significance: Extroversion-Introversion (E/I) vs. expressed Inclusion (eI), vs. expressed Affection (eA), and vs. wanted Inclusion (wI). Thus, even though the hypothesized relationships with style of self-presentation were not demonstrable, support was found for the underlying rationale relating one's habitual style of perceiving and judging his world to his wants and self-expectations in his inter personal processes.

Imbedded in the rationale underlying the experimental hypotheses was the notion that as opposed to an orientation towards oneself, an orientation towards others and towards the outside world would involve greater interaction with things and with other people.

Thus, S's presenting themselves via group relevant categories were expected to be more extroverted (to involve themselves with the world outside them) than were the S's presenting themselves via internal processes. To the extent that one is interacting with the outside world, he is available for some form of feedback. Consequently, he is more likely to be more comfortable with patterns of behavior and ways of perceiving the world in which he would participate and interact with those around him.

Dominance, as opposed to passivity, implies an interaction, as opposed to withdrawal from others. Furthermore, love, as opposed to hostility, implies a

moving towards others if for no other reason than that the culture does not foster direct expression of hostile impulses, and that as a consequence hostility often must be redirected or even turned inward. That is, hostility becomes more a private and personal experience or at least a process separated from the object of hostility.

On the other hand, the expression of love is more consonant with cultural values. Even though full expressions of loving impulses are not always tolerated, a moving toward the object of love in general, or people in particular, is regarded as appropriate and acceptable.

Thus, love and dominance may be regarded as consistent with extroversion, whereas hostility and passivity may be considered as consonant with introversion for the reason that loving and dominance lead towards other people, but hostility and passivity tend to lead away from other people.

Intercorrelations between the extroversion-introversion scale of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the scales of the Leary Interpersonal Check List support these contentions. For females, extroversion-introversion (continuous scores) was significantly and negatively correlated with perceived self (dominance) $r = -.39$, others' views (dominance) $r = -.36$, perceived self (love) $r = -.24$, and ideal self (love) $r = -.25$.

For males, the extroversion-introversion scores were correlated significantly and negatively with perceived self (dominance) $r = -.39$, others' views (dominance) $r = -.26$, perceived self (love) $r = -.24$, and others' views (love) $r = -.21$.

It would seem, then, that dominance-passivity and love-hostility are conceptually related to the process of inclusion-exclusion. From the above line

of reasoning, therefore, we should expect both dominance and love to be positively related to the Inclusion Scales of the FIRO-B. For females, expressed inclusion (eI) was significantly related to perceived self (love) r = .43, and to ideal self (dominance) r = .25. For the males, expressed inclusion was significantly related to perceived self (love) r = .46, to ideal self (love) r = .20, and to others' views (love) r = .36. In addition, the wanted inclusion scores were significantly related to perceived self (love) r = .27 for the females.

Both dominance and control are aspects of power and authority. We might expect, therefore, that they are intimately interwoven with aggressive or assertive behavior. When we separate males from females some intriguing relationships between dominance and control become manifest using the Leary and the FIRO-B scales.

For males, others' views (dominance) was positively correlated with expressed control (eC), and percieved self (dominance) was positively related to wanted control (wC). For females, however, though a positive correlation existed between others' views (dominance) and expressed control (eC), a negative correlation was found between perceived self (dominance) and wanted control (wC). None of these four correlations was very large; they all barely reached significance, suggesting that in each group there may have existed counter trends opposing the main relationship.

To the extent that "others' views" is a projection or a special kind of self-view, it is consistent that others' views (dominance) and expressed control (eC) are positively related. Due to the role expectations of males, however, those who indicated that others viewed them as being low in dominance

might also have tended to express control (eC) behavior to a high degree as an attempt to become more dominant in the eyes of others. Therefore, a strong positive relationship between these two variables could be somewhat reduced.

Role expectations for females might have resulted in an analagous counteraction of trends whereby the main relationship could have been due primarily to the females who expressed low control (eC) and also saw others as viewing them low on dominance. But as an attempt to become more in accord with cultural expectations, that is, to become less dominant in the eyes of others, those who indicated that others viewed them as highly dominant, could have tended to avoid expressing control behavior, thereby attenuating the positive relationship between others' views (dominance) and expressed control (eC).

The low but significant negative correlation between perceived self (dominance) and wanted control (wC) for the females, and the low but significant positive correlation between these two variables for the males becomes understandable when one takes into consideration Schutz' notion that "the need for control defined at the level of perceiving the self, is the need to feel that one is a competent, responsible person" (P. 20). Low dominance implies a degree of passivity which may be regarded as restricting assertiveness or strong self-restraint. It seems plausible that the exercise of strong self-restraint would accompany a desire or wish for others to do the controlling, if nothing more than for the sake of the economics of one's energy. In a cultural framework where women are expected to be somewhat passive (though not wholly so), external controls over their impulses would help them to feel that they are maintaining their sense of social responsibility and therefore sustain their feelings of adequacy as persons.

The males, on the other hand are expected to be more dominant in role, but it may be that college students tend to be more passive than they would like to be, and in controlling themselves they resent the control from others. Undoubtedly a portion of this sample perceived themselves as high on dominance and not appreciating this, would therefore want to be controlled by others. Such counter trends would seem to account for the lower order of the correlation. Finally, the strong positive correlation between the perceived self (love) and wanted control for the females seems once again consistent with the position taken by Schutz (P. 20). From a cultural point of view, females perceiving themselves as loving are nevertheless expected to contain their affectional impulses to some ill defined level of appropriateness. Since the norms and standards of appropriateness are at best unclear, the wish for control by others may be considered as a fear that left to their own controls, they might behave in ways considered irresponsible both by themselves and others.

Implications For Further Investigation

Since it was observed that individuals present themselves through an admixture of group relevant characteristics and internal processes, a question arises as to what determines the particular emphasis. Why does the person present himself as a student, man, white, when these data are to a great extent self-evident and therefore somewhat repetitious? Might such behavior be interpreted as simply that of compliance to an otherwise unrewarding task? Do these persons view themselves as categorical entities, assuming the self to be identified only in terms of role or membership? If so, what do their internal processes mean to them?

The same questions might be asked of those who presented themselves primarily in terms of what they characterisitically feel or experience. To say "I am a happy, considerate individual" or "I am feeling confused" implies a desire to be seen that way, and may be another means of describing who they are value-wise. Is this form of self-presentation a way of establishing the kind of relationship desired? If so, what does role or group membership mean to them?

From one point of view, any self-presentation may be regarded as a set of instructions about the way the person wants to be treated, and how he intends to relate to the others at the time and place he finds himself. Implicit in his presentations, however, are core aspects of his self-system which are to be sustained and maintained. Simultaneously, there may be other factors which he can discard or reject if they become inconsistent with or contradictory to more central features of his identity. In some ways, what he initially conveys, he is stuck with, and will have to adapt to these features even

though he doesn't really accept them. The belligerent, tough guy who at a later stage would like to be seen as a gentle person has to resolve this dilemma in his self-presentations without appearing to be phony. The child identified with a particular peer group which flaunts its disregard for authority may identify with a classroom teacher at the cost of his being seen by his peers as betraying them.

From another point of reference self-presentations towards strangers may necessitate exploring common reference groups before internal processes can be shared. Thus, trust and confidence in both the self and the other may be related to the kind of self-presentation exhibited at a particular time.

It would seem that the next logical step following this study would be to explore transactions between two persons to find out what each perceives in his own and the other's presentations of self. Thus, external validations, both at the written and oral level would be provided to follow-up on the trends found in the interpersonal and intrapersonal perceptions of the S's in this study. If it is found that group relevant characteristics precede presenting internal processes, then these cues can be refined towards being used as measures of trust or intimacy in a relationship. If it is found that individuals characteristically present themselves via group relevant qualities in spite of the context, then such results would signal the makings of a trait, to be predicted along with other stable characteristics.

In any event, self-presentation styles may be regarded as a fruitful route to establishing a clearer understanding of the self-concept in general.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bugental, F.T., and Gunning, E., "Investigations Into Self-Concept: II. Stability of Reported Self-Identifications," Journal of Clinical Psychology, vol. XI, No. 1, Jan. 1955, pp. 41-46.

2. Bugental, F.T., and Zelen, S.L., "Investigations Into the 'Self-Concept': I. The W-A-Y Technique," Journal of Personality, Vol. 18, 1950, pp. 483-98.

3. Calvin, A.D. and Holtzman, W.H., "Adjustment and the Discrepancy Between Self-Concept and Inferred Self", Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. XVII, No. 1, Feb. 1953, pp. 39-44.

4. Goffman, E., The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, Garden City, New York; Doubleday and Co., 1959.

5. Goodman, G.M., "Findings From a Study of Emotional Disclosure in Psychotherapy Relationships", Discussion Paper of the Counseling Center, University of Chicago, Vol. VIII, No. 13, Dec. 1962.

6. Grigg, A.E., and Kelley, H.P., "A Scale for Self Description", Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 16, 1960, pp. 153-8.

7. Jourard, S.M., "A Study in Self-Disclosure", Scientific American, Vol. 198, 1958, pp. 77-82.

8. Jourard, S.M., "Self-Disclosure and Other-Cathexis", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 59, Nov. 1959, pp. 428-31.

9. Jourard, S.M., "Self-Disclosure Scores and Grades in Nursing College", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 45, 1961, pp. 244-47.

10. Jourard, S.M., The Transparent Self: Self-Disclosure and Well-Being, Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nastrand, 1963.

11. Jourard, S.M., and Landsman, P., "Cognition, Cahtexis, and the Dyadic Effect in Men's Self-Disclosing Behavior," Merrill Palmer Quarterly, Vol. 6, 1960, pp. 178-85.

12. Jourard, S.M., and Laskow, P., "Some Factors in Self-Disclosure," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 56, 1958, pp. 91-8.

13. Kuhn, M.H. and McPartland, T.S., "An Empirical Investigation of Self-Attitudes, " American Sociological Review, Vol. 19, 1954, pp. 68-76.

14. Leary, T., Multilevel Measurements of Interpersonal Behavior, Berkeley; Psychological Consultation Service, 1956.

15. Maslow, A., Toward A Psychology of Being, Princeton, N.J.: Van Nastrand, 1962.

16. Mason, E., "Some Factors in Self-Judgments", Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 10, 1954, pp. 336-40.

17. Myers, E.B., The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1962.

18. Rogers, C.R., On Becoming A Person, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

19. Roseman, S., "Changes in the Representation of Self, Other, and Interrelationship in Client-Centered Therapy", Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 2, No. 4, 1955, pp. 271-8.

20. Sarbin, T., "Role Theory", in Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954, p. 244.

21. Schutz, W.C., FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Relations, New York: Rinehart and Co., 1958.

22. Stricker, L.J., and Ross, J., A Description and Evaluation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Princeton, New Jersey; Educational Testing Service, 1962.

23. Tolor, A., "Self-Perceptions of Neuropsychiatric Patients on the W-A-Y Test", Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 13, 1957, pp. 403-6.

24. Woodworth, R.S., Personal Data Sheet, Chicago: C.H. Stoelting, 1917.

25. Zelen, S.L., Sheehan, J.G., and Bugental, F.T., "Self-Perceptions in Stuttering", Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 10, 1954, pp. 70-72.